

2025:PHHC:103559



136

**IN THE HIGH COURT OF PUNJAB & HARYANA  
AT CHANDIGARH**

**RA-RS No. 43 of 2025 (O&M) in  
ESA No. 7 of 2025  
Date of Decision: 11.08.2025**

Lata Rani @ Hem Lata

..... Appellant

**Versus**

Ved Parkash Sethi and others

..... Respondents

**CORAM: HON'BLE MR. JUSTICE HARKESH MANUJA**

Present: Mr. Kanwal Goyal, Advocate with  
Ms. Shruti Goyal, Advocate  
for the applicant-appellant.

Mr. A.K. Khunger, Advocate  
for respondent No. 1.

\*\*\*\*

**HARKESH MANUJA, J. (ORAL)**

**CM-8999-C-2025**

Prayer in the present application, moved on behalf of the applicant-appellant, is for condonation of 21 days' delay in filing the review application

Notice of the application qua contesting respondent No. 1- Decree Holder only.

Upon advance notice, Mr. A.K. Khunger, Advocate, appears on behalf of respondent No. 1 and raises no objection against the prayer made in the application.

Having heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the contents of the application, which is duly supported by the affidavit of applicant-appellant, the same is allowed and the delay of 21 days in filing the

review application is condoned.

**MAIN REVIEW**

The applicant-appellant, by way of present review application, seeks reviewing the order / judgment dated 02.04.2025 passed by this Court, whereby the Execution Second Appeal (ESA) preferred at the instance of applicant-appellant, was dismissed.

[2] The contention raised on behalf of the applicant-appellant is that the decree for possession by way of specific performance was passed in favour of respondent No. 1 on the basis of an agreement to sell dated 08.09.2005 for the area measuring 346 square feet and even the sale deed dated 01.10.2018 which was executed in terms of the said decree also specifies the area to be 346 square feet, however, during the possession proceedings, respondent No. 1- Decree Holder is being handed over an area measuring 360 square feet.

[3] Having heard learned counsel for the parties and gone through the records, it appears that the agreement to sell dated 08.09.2005 related to a shop and the possession also is being offered of the said shop only. In such circumstances, the applicant cannot be permitted to agitate any such issue, once the possession being handed over was of the property which was subsequent matter of the agreement and the sale deed.

[4] In view of the above, no ground to entertain the prayer made in the instant review application is made out.

[5] Review Application is **dismissed**.

**August 11, 2025**

*'dk kamra'*

**( HARKESH MANUJA )**  
**JUDGE**

<i>Whether Speaking/reasoned</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>
<i>Whether Reportable</i>	<i>Yes/No</i>